

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

BRUCE PARKER,
Plaintiff,
v.

BRANDON LEE, *et al.*,
Defendants.

Case No. 23-11684

Matthew F. Leitman
United States District Judge

Curtis Ivy, Jr.
United States Magistrate Judge

ORDER REGARDING PENDING MOTIONS (ECF Nos. 56, 59)

On June 3, 2025, Plaintiff Bruce Parker filed a motion for an amended scheduling order. (ECF No. 56). The motion is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. The Court has not yet entered a case management order, so there is no such order to amend. The motion is also defective to the extent that Plaintiff seeks an initial case management order. (*Id.* at PageID.438-39 (asking for discovery dates and a trial date)). The Court will issue such an order but only after the remaining Defendants have filed an answer to Plaintiff's complaint.

Defendants' answer to the complaint is due June 23, 2025. (ECF No. 55). On June 18, 2025, Defendants moved for an extension of the deadline for their answer. (ECF No. 59). They argue that there is good cause for an extension because defense counsel entered her appearance on June 18, 2025, (ECF No. 58), just days before the answer's due date. Accordingly, counsel needs more time to review the case's procedural history and the remaining claims in Plaintiff's

complaint. (ECF No. 59, PageID.454-55). In order to review the remaining seven claims, Defendants request an additional twenty-one days for their response. (*Id.* at PageID.455).¹

Since Defendants filed their motion before the due date for their answer, Rule 6(b)(1)(A) guides the Court's analysis. This Rule permits an extension where there is good cause to do so. The Court finds good cause here that warrants an extension. Defense counsel has only just started working on this case—the Court will not force her to complete twenty-one days of work in just five days. The Court also agrees that an extension of time will not prejudice Plaintiff since Defendants' answer is the only pending matter at this time. Accordingly, Defendants' motion is **GRANTED**. Defendants' answer is now due **July 14, 2025**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

The parties here may object to and seek review of this Order, but are required to file any objections within 14 days of service as provided for in Federal

¹ The Court can offer some clarity on this matter here. Defendant pointed out a discrepancy in the Court's filings regarding the equal protection claim against Defendant Keranen. (ECF No. 59, PageID.452-53 n.1). On May 15, 2024, the undersigned recommended that the equal protection claims against Defendants Lee, Thompson, and Keranen be dismissed. (ECF No. 36, PageID.278-79). On June 11, 2024, the District Judge adopted that recommendation and explicitly dismissed those equal protection claims. (ECF No. 40, PageID.375). The statement in the undersigned's subsequent Report and Recommendation (which was ultimately terminated as moot, (ECF No. 54)) suggesting the equal protection claim against Keranen remained was erroneous. (ECF No. 45, PageID.400).

Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a) and Local Rule 72.1(d). A party may not assign as error any defect in this Order to which timely objection was not made. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). Any objections are required to specify the part of the Order to which the party objects and state the basis of the objection. When an objection is filed to a magistrate judge's ruling on a non-dispositive motion, the ruling remains in effect unless it is stayed by the magistrate judge or a district judge. E.D. Mich. Local Rule 72.2.

Date: June 23, 2025

s/Curtis Ivy, Jr.
Curtis Ivy, Jr.
United States Magistrate Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that this document was served on counsel of record and any unrepresented parties via the Court's ECF System or by First Class U.S. mail on June 23, 2025.

s/Sara Krause
Case Manager
(810) 341-7850